

## ***Revised Minutes*** ***Process Standardization Working Group Meeting***

**Wednesday, April 18, 2001, 9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.**

Grand Canyon State Electrical Cooperative

120 N. 44<sup>th</sup> St Suite 100, Phoenix

	<b><i>Topic</i></b>	<b><i>Lead</i></b>	<b><i>Anticipated Outcome</i></b>	<b><i>Att.</i></b>
1	Welcome, Introductions, Sign-In, and Approval of Minutes	Tony Gillooly	Mr. Gillooly welcomed participants to the full group session of the Process Standardization Working Group meeting. A sign-in sheet was circulated. Participants introduced themselves. Minutes from the April 4, 2001 meeting were approved with the addition to point #4 where the group agreed to standardize the warning letters to the MRSP and Utilities Director.	
2	Report from Janie Mollon on revised Change Control Process	Janie Mollon	<p>Janie Mollon (New West Energy) presented a redlined version of the change control process. The group did not discuss how this document would be posted on the ACC website.</p> <p>Shirley Renfroe will take over the chairperson position of this task team.</p> <p><b>Action Item:</b></p> <p>It was suggested that participants take the document back to their companies and review it more thoroughly. Bring comments to the May 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting</p>	
3	Report from Staff on the definition of Final Bill Issue 84	ACC Staff	<p>Staff confirmed the definition of "Final Bill" and reported on the section of the Rules, which prohibit the estimation of Final Bills and DA bills.</p> <p>The ESPs are correct in how they use the term "customer" (see example), and the UDC's may use the same definition. The customer is defined as whom the bill is issued to. EX: If there are 50 Walgreens, and the UDC bills to one entity for all 50 stores, then there would not be a final bill if one Walgreens chose another generation provider. This does not eliminate the conflict when the bill is sent to each individual store, and that one store chooses another provider.</p> <p>Two waivers are needed to resolve the issue: 1. Waiver to have the ability estimate final bill, 2. Waiver to have the ability to estimate usage for a DA customer requiring load data. In the waiver, it must be indicated how the rules should be re-written.</p> <p><b>The waiver needs to be very specific about the instances where estimation may occur.</b></p> <p><b>Action Item:</b></p> <p>A joint waiver was suggested to resolve these issues. Judy Taylor (TEP) will bring a draft waiver for "estimating the final bill". Judy will also look into creating the waiver for estimating usage of a DA customer, based on the "final bill" waiver for the May 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting.</p> <p><b>Action Item:</b></p> <p>Participants to contact their people to determine if each company is comfortable in supporting the joint waiver.</p>	

4	Q&A for Task Team Chair addressing Issue 101: MRSP Performance Monitoring and Testing	John Wallace	<p>John Wallace reported on the status of the task team. Terms were defined, event, exception, violation, out of compliance. Problems were identified in how to count the various events/violations/exceptions for the PMR. This topic is to be discussed in the next meeting. Draft warning letters were standardized. Minutes and warning letters were sent out 4/18/01 by Mary Ippolito</p> <p>The warning letters going to ESP and MRSP are still a problem. There are some confidentiality issues in revealing the problems of an MRSP in other ESP territories to all other ESP's. Kathy Flood (SRP) requested a legal clarification from ACC legal department on this issue.</p> <p>Janie Mollon proposed monitoring solely by ESP (eliminate the aggregate monitoring), it will not be as complicated to monitor and eliminates the legal ramifications of sending warning letters to all ESP's</p> <p>John Wallace will be the new chair as Janie Mollon has been re-assigned at New West Energy.</p> <p>An action item report from staff regarding to what happens to the letter sent to the director of the utilities division.</p> <p>The letter must state that it is an informal complaint. A person on the utilities director's office staff will handle the issue. If this does not resolve the issue, the formal complaint process must begin.</p> <p><b>Action Item:</b> Barbara Keene will contact the Staff legal department for clarification on the right of the UDC to send warning letters to ESP's regarding the performance of their MRSPs in other ESP territories.</p>	1
5	Q&A for Task Team Chair addressing Issue 61: MSP Performance Monitoring and Testing	John Wallace	<p>John Wallace (GCSECA) reported on the status of the task team. The conclusion of the April 17 meeting was to disband until other processes are completed in order to have processes to monitor.</p> <p>Janie Mollon would like to see work continue to be a model for other states and to improve customer relationships, and reduce any negative impact to customers.</p> <p>Stacy Aguayo would like to see safety issues covered, as safety is a high priority. Jenine Schenk reported that the entire safety field hasn't been discussed in the metering task teams, or defined in the metering handbook.</p> <p>PSWG recommended the group disband at this point, however reserve time on 5/2/01 and discuss which issues are causing problems in measuring, or what items can be measured. Once issues are identified the group can determine when the MSP Performance Task Team can begin meeting again.</p> <p>See attached report of the meeting on April 17<sup>th</sup>, 2001.</p>	

6	Q&A for Task Team Chair addressing Issue 107: Develop a document showing all agreed upon Metering business rules	Stacy Aguayo	<p>Stacy Aguayo (APS) reported on the status of the task team. Stacy will create a master document of changes showing all substantive changes to text. Comments due no later than May 2<sup>nd</sup>. Each future meeting will have a two-hour discussion on these changes, beginning May 16<sup>th</sup>.</p>
---	--	--------------	--

TEP has not had time to review the document fully, but would like to see a glossary instead of having terms defined rather than defined in the text. Example section 3.7

Sections of the Handbook from the Operating Procedures, that cannot have content changes because it is an approved document: (requires using the change control process):

Section 2: MSP qualifications, 3.10 Primary metering and 3.4 ANSI standards

Staff mentioned metering form packet has not been approved changes can still be made.

Comments on the metering form packet from Staff: Two UDCs are missing: Ajo Improvement Company, Morenci Water and Electric (Pgs 5 & 21 data elements). Can these UDCs be listed in this document despite not participating in the formation of the document?

Report from Staff on Section 1.6 metering Handbook: This section is redundant from the rules, suggested removing the section details, but reference the State Rules (a general reference, not a specific listing of a rule).

**Action Item:** Barbara will contact the two missing UDCs and advise them of the work of the PSWG and what standards have been developed. She will add them to distribution list so they can become active participants. Status report at May 2 mtg.

7	Approval of field requirement in the AZ 810 to Conditional from Mandatory	Tony Gillooly	The participants reported on which of the three options their company support.
			<p>APS, SRP, CUC: suggest that the Market drive the changes.</p> <p>TEP would not allow the “conditional” option; leave it as mandatory, or change to optional.</p>
			<p>Gene Slechta and Shirley Renfroe reviewed Conditional Items in the 810 and identified that sufficient detail was present in the gray boxes for all the conditional items. The issue of beginning and end reads being mandatory/conditional has yet to be resolved. The beginning and ending read is required if it's a residential customer.</p>
			<p>For residential customers over 20 KW, if an external MRSP is selected the MRSP must calculate the beginning and ending reads and supply 867. If SRP has an external MRSP, <del>residential customers over 20kW there is no way to get or calculate the reads.</del> If SRP is the MRSP, there is not a problem in sending the reads on the 810.</p>
			<p>Ken Grove (APSES) says they could get reads if they use an external MRSP in SRP's territory by going out and reading the meters themselves. Someone (ESP or MRSP, or both) will need additional systems/programs to get that data into their system</p>
8	Issue 100	Tony Gillooly	<p>TEP confirmed waiving a fee for meter testing if the meter was tested within a given time period.</p> <p>Tony Gillooly said that when a DA customer returns to SO, if the meter is in good shape and has been tested (calibrated) in the last 5 years, the meter would be purchased by TEP without charging a testing fee.</p> <p>This issue has been resolved; all UDCs have processes set up to accommodate this issue.</p>

9	VEE Document	Janie Mollon	<p>The VEE document was reviewed.</p> <p>Janie mentioned that once again, she received <b>no</b> comments regarding the appendix.</p> <p>Citizens would like more time to review the document as they have a new vendor reviewing the document. Citizens also wondered if lawyers looked at this document because there is a considerable amount of vague language including terms like “reasonable”, “questionable” and “suspicious”. Janie Mollon thinks at least a dozen lawyers through the California utilities looked at it. The vague terms were used because there were so many variations or instances to be precisely covered and still have a manageable document.</p> <p>Discuss changes at June 6<sup>th</sup> meeting, and <b>determine</b> if a task team leader will be needed to further edit the document.</p> <p>Other comments/changes regarding the document from Stacy Aguayo:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Section 4.3.1 and 4.3.2 states the MRSP will be notified however it doesn't specify who will notify them. In both sections, it's the MSP who is responsible for notifying. Need to add MSP into these sections.</li> <li>2) 3.4.1 Pulse overflow – suggest adding language that specifies that field investigation will take place for <u>any</u> occurrence of pulse overflow.</li> <li>3) Appendix – High low usage check – need to add a 5<sup>th</sup> bullet “Validity of zero usage values”.</li> </ol> <p><b>Action Item:</b> Citizens will have comments for June 6, 2001</p>
10	Issue 55: UDC fees for Direct Access services (CISR, DASR, metering, meter reading, billing, settlement, etc.) are too high and not consistent between UDCs. (APSES)	Tony Gillooly	Participants agreed to close the issue, because as Jim Wontor (APSES) suggested, PSWG is not the appropriate place to pursue these issues.
11	Issue 81: What information is provided on a CISR from each UDC and is that information consistent	Tony Gillooly	Participants agreed to close the issue, because as Jim Wontor (APSES) suggested, PSWG is not the appropriate place to pursue these issues.

12	Issue 75: On incoming DASR – only kWh meter number is required. State DASR handbook does not accommodate a kWh meter and Kvar meters, or other metering combinations.		<p>The group discussed the issue, and it was thought that it was understood to send one DASR per service delivery point, regardless of the number of meters at the service point.</p> <p>The EMI will indicate if there is more than one meter at the site. Janet Henry (AXON) says an MSP that gets an EMI indicating kVAR meter is required, an MSP will install one meter that reads both kWh and KVAR. Typically the MSP will leave the mechanical UDC kVAR meter wired and operating. UDC will have to remove their kVAR meter, or require a site meet.</p> <p>SRP and APS: Require one DASR for kWh meter only -not two DASRs.</p> <p><b>Action Item:</b> Confirm how the UDCs want the DASR's submitted when there are multiple meters at a site.</p>
13	Issue 83: When customer switches from DA back to SO or ESP to ESP and the MRSP has not provided meter read data (or estimated reads) for previous months, what should the UDC/ESP do to retrieve missing data? How can the final bill get trued-up? Should the UDC/ESP be allowed to estimate the final bill?	Tony Gillooly	<p>Part of this issue is covered in the MRSP Performance Monitoring issue 101. <u>When customer switches from DA back to SO or ESP to ESP and the MRSP has not provided meter read data (or estimated reads) for previous months, what should the UDC/ESP do to retrieve missing data?</u> If the file is posted as an exception, the second month without data makes the MRSP out of compliance.</p> <p>How can the final bill be trued up?</p> <p>This issue is resolved, part is to be covered in performance monitoring, and the other two parts of this issue have been covered and have been resolved.</p>
14	Issue 94: What is the timeframe for UDC to exchange the meters to return direct access customers to bundled ser-vice	Tony Gillooly	<p>The time frame is: if the DASR is submitted 15 days prior to the read date, the meter change will occur on the read date. If not, the meter change will occur on the next read date. As stated by rule : R14-2-1612-J</p> <p>This issue is deferred until the market demands this item be addressed</p>
15	Review Open issues and re-prioritize	Tony Gillooly	The group reviewed Open issues.

16	New Issues	Tony Gillooly	<p><b>NOTE:</b> Janie Mollon will no longer be able to chair any task teams as her role has been re-assigned at New West Energy. She will no longer attend Arizona meetings. At this time it is unknown who will attend AZ meetings on behalf of New West Energy.</p> <p><b>Action Item:</b> Schedule for future meeting locations. Continue with first and third weeks, or change to once a month?</p> <p><b><u>New Issues</u></b></p> <p>issue 113: Do the performance standards created for MRSPs and MSPs apply to the UDCs and Coops</p> <p>Issue 114: What are (are there) state the timing requirements for meter testing?</p> <p>Issue 115: How will kVAR meters be removed when both kVAR and kWh meters are present at a site and an MSP installs a single meter that can read both kVAR and kWh?</p>
17	Meeting Evaluation	Tony Gillooly	The group provided feedback.
18	Set Next Agenda	Tony Gillooly	The group set the next agenda.
19	Adjourn Meeting	Tony Gillooly	The meeting was adjourned.

## PARTICIPANT LIST

PARTICIPANTS AT APRIL 18, 2001  
PROCESS STANDARDIZATION WORKING GROUP

Name	Organization
Aguayo, Stacy	APS
Brown, Debbie	SRP
Cobb, Anne	TRICO
Flood, Kathy	SRP
Gillooly, Tony	TEP
Greenrock, June	SRP
Grove, Ken	APSES
Henry, Janet	AXON
Keene, Barbara	Commission Staff
McArthur, Stephen	Mohave
Mollon, Janie	New West Energy
Pichoff, Darrel	KR Saline & Associates
Renfroe, Shirley	Pinnacle West
Schenk, Jenine	APS
Scott, Barry	SSVEC
Slechta, Gene	SRP
Taylor, Judy	TEP
Torkelson, LeeAnn	R.W. Beck / Citizens
Wallace, John	GCSECA